

学校编码: 10384

分类号_____密级_____

学号: B200204002

UDC_____

廈門大學

博士学位论文

On the Norm of Intercultural Ethic in Translation

论跨文化伦理对翻译的规约

葛 林

指导教师姓名: 连淑能 教授

专业名称: 英语语言文学

论文提交日期: 2008 年 2 月

论文答辩时间: 年 月

学位授予日期: 年 月

答辩委员会主席: _____

评 阅 人: _____

2008 年 5 月

厦门大学学位论文原创性声明

兹提交的学位论文，是本人在导师指导下独立完成的研究成果。本人在论文写作中参考的其他个人或集体的研究成果，均在文中以明确方式标明。本人依法享有和承担由此论文产生的权利和责任。

声明人（签名）：

年 月 日

厦门大学学位论文著作权使用声明

本人完全了解厦门大学有关保留、使用学位论文的规定。厦门大学有权保留并向国家主管部门或其指定机构送交论文的纸质版和电子版，有权将学位论文用于非赢利目的的少量复制并允许论文进入学校图书馆被查阅，有权将学位论文的内容编入有关数据库进行检索，有权将学位论文的标题和摘要汇编出版。保密的学位论文在解密后适用本规定。

本学位论文属于

1. 保密（ ），在年解密后适用本授权书。
2. 不保密（ ）

（请在以上相应括号内打“√”）

作者签名： 日期： 年 月 日

导师签名： 日期： 年 月 日

Synopsis

This study is motivated by a strong impulse to recount intercultural ethic, an extensively accepted balance normalizing harmonious, respectful and beneficial coexistence of cultural constellations, so that translation could serve better the democratic, peaceful and cooperative agenda and a translator's motivation, strategies, behaviors and responses can be more suitably effected and examined. The "cultural turn" in translation studies has put translation researches in a wider cultural context with epoch-making significance. Nonetheless, past and current studies, which have merely focused on the search for cultural interpretation of a translation process and its ends, are grounded on the assumption of equitable bicultural or multicultural contact in history, international status, attitude, value, etc. More in-depth discussions are found in postcolonial and feminist translation studies, both of which are centered upon how to mediate, facilitate, reveal or resist colonialism, neocolonialism or sexism with the emphasis on cultural function of translation strategies and textual selection. Despite their remarkable contribution for intercultural ethic, they appear stagnant so far with quite a number of urgent questions yet to answer. For instance, how have translation acts supported intercultural ethic? How are the deeds against intercultural ethic interrogated? What to do for better normalization of intercultural ethic in translation studies and practices? Besides, translation also works between other cultural communities like religious groups and classes. There exist multiple means for a translation's promotion or prohibition of decent intercultural communication. Many translations against intercultural ethic cannot be simply considered as imperialist, neoimperialist or sexist. Many translations normalized with intercultural ethic are not only for resistance. A translation for or against intercultural ethic can receive diverse responses from readers, critics or patrons with different ideological inclinations. However, all the studies relevant with these aspects are not fully carried out. Therefore, with her relatively close attention to the necessity, means and effects of the normalization of intercultural ethic in translation theorization and activities, the present author's explicit intention is to push for more dedicated devotion to culture-oriented translation studies for their smoothly continuous development.

The whole article consists of six chapters with Chapter II, III and IV dominant.

Chapter I is an introduction to the research, including its theoretical background, impetus, angles and major methods. A concise survey of culture-oriented translation studies, studies on translation ethics and studies on translation norms is made for more explicit definition of intercultural ethic and its significance.

Chapter II focuses on the review of the researches on fidelity from the perspectives of translators' status, language layers for fidelity, degrees of fidelity, fidelity to foreignness, etc., the challenge to some of the questionable researches, e.g. André Lefevere's contrastive analysis of Chinese and Western traditions of fidelity, and the crystallization of how proper cultural motivations are more often than not brushed aside in former and current fidelity-freedom debates. If these questions are approached from the angle of intercultural ethic, the conventional binary division can be dissolved with better explanation. So far as intercultural ethic is concerned, fidelity is not constantly featured with plausibility. Meanwhile, Warren(1989:20) and Chesterman (1997:180) give prominence to responsible cooperation with each other. Nevertheless, a translation subject bicultural or multicultural is inclined toward particular cultural community. With its likely violation of intercultural ethic, despite pleasant interaction between them, readability, patronage and translation criticism might not be identified as advisable. Intercultural ethic as a norm is indispensable for the decency of a translation activity.

Studies on translators' subjectivity are frequently concerned only with how it is developed with the neglect of impartial intercultural causality. In Chapter III, the author elaborates how intercultural ethic offers new grounds for reflecting on translators' subjectivity in terms of translation methods and author-translator dichotomy. Such strategies challenging translation conventions in favor of intercultural ethic as cannibalism, hybridity, foreignization, domestication and hijacking are examined together with relevant translation studies regarding their strengths and weaknesses. For instance, after a statistical analysis of more than 670 articles with the key words of *yihua* and translation, the following conclusions are drawn: it was at least in 1999 that Lawrence Venuti's foreignization began to attract close domestic attention. Prior to it, the native strategy of *yihua* was more involved; by the year 2006, more Chinese scholars preferred foreignization to domestication to transfer better the foreignness of source texts, which might have been attributed to Venuti's studies; most Chinese

scholars have not blindly followed the Western theory with their advocacy of justifiable linkage of the two strategies according to translators' intention, text types, etc.; in spite of growing interest in it, intercultural ethic is less emphasized as ideological ideal of the strategies than cultural transmission in China. Translators' subjectivity governed with intercultural ethic in interactive translation, autotranslation and the author's translation invalidates traditional belief in author-translator dichotomy. Furthermore, intercultural ethic proves a relative norm of translators' subjectivity with Sydney Shapiro's and Pearl Buck's translations and social responses to the Chinese version of *The Gadfly*, etc. The present author, an exponent of René Descartes's theories, strives for unambiguous elaboration on the interplay between intercultural ethic and sociohistorical environments, where a translator can consciously affect the identification of intercultural ethic. To add, intercultural ethic normalizes translators' subjectivity in combination with other parameters like official policies, social backgrounds, personal preference, etc.

Chapter IV discusses the ways intercultural ethic normalizes translation. Five major means are pointed out, namely, simplex or multiplex normalization, multichannel normalization, unilateral or interactive normalization, semi-detached normalization and accepted or repulsed normalization. Above all, intercultural ethic might manipulate translation in a complex sense. Considering cultural multiplicity, a translator might adopt similar or distinct strategies for or against different varieties of intercultural ethic; given cultural mobility, the effects of a same intercultural ethic may vary from time to time, and one type of intercultural ethic can be recaptured for another type. Secondly, intercultural ethic is backed up through diverse channels. Texts for intercultural ethic, against intercultural ethic or without visible relevance with intercultural ethic can all be translated for it with miscellaneous techniques. Thirdly, translations normalized with intercultural ethic do not arise from a translator's unilateral efforts without exception. As the author might shift his/her ground and revise the original in alignment with the translator, intercultural ethic can be reciprocally upheld, which falsifies Roland Barthes (1977:148)'s subscription to the priority of the author's death and Paul de Man (1986:84)'s argument for the original's death. Fourthly, semi-detachedness is characteristic of intercultural ethic in action. The recognition of intercultural ethic as a focus in postcolonial and feminist translation studies is established on the premise of special historical contexts and theories like psychoanalysis, deconstructionism,

Marxism, etc. In face of the retrospection at insufficient length, the author attempts to review as systematically as possible. Lastly, whether or not intercultural ethic can be officially embraced depends on its conformity to dominant ideologies and patronage in the target culture. At times, there exist consequentially the conflicts between conventional ideological codes and intercultural ethic, which is made idiosyncratic. It indicates that ideology occasionally hinders translations for intercultural ethic. Also, patrons might be distinguishable from each other with discrepant stances. Translations for intercultural ethic, though prohibited by official patrons, can come out and get propagated under favorable auspices of other patrons, and some patrons can nurture texts repudiated by patrons in other nations for intercultural ethic. The Manipulation School has evidently not dissected patronage of translation thoroughly enough.

A translation for intercultural ethic is not definitely properly undertaken. The present author thereby seeks to dwell on the avenues to its apt production and reception in Chapter V. With a database consisting of almost ten biblical English versions, the appraisal of TNIV translators' strategies is discussed. Besides, together with a large number of other instances, three preconditions are advanced, i.e. appropriate translation strategies for intercultural ethic, rational patronage for intercultural ethic and sensible translation criticism for intercultural ethic. Among them, the imperviousness of most scholars to the conceptualization of a professional's responsibility for qualified evaluation has put the present author in the way of formulating three related principles.

Chapter VI summarizes the whole dissertation with some suggestion for further studies. In view of the imperative of translation for non-violent and reasonable communication between sociocultural groups, intercultural ethic, which exists reasonably, needs an abundantly intent gaze.

Key words: intercultural ethic; translation ethics; norms; translation subjects; translation

摘要

跨文化伦理作为协调并衡量平等、公正、和平、友好的文化群体间交往的尺度，是保证合理译介原语文化和丰富译语文化，从而推进人类文化整体进程的重要因素，对于译者的翻译动机、翻译策略、翻译行为和翻译效果具有重要影响。然而，迄今为止，相关的翻译研究还没有形成一个较为深厚的体系。肇始于 20 世纪 70 年代的翻译研究的“文化转向”，将翻译放置于更为广阔的文化语境中考察，成为翻译研究历史上具有划时代意义的重要变革。然而，已有的研究较多停留于寻求翻译过程及结果的目的文化动因，其前提在于假定翻译行为相关的双文化或多文化在历史、国际地位、态度、价值观念等方面彼此平等，理所当然地将翻译理论及实践放置于公正、民主、互利的文化交流背景中。较深入的探讨表现为后殖民主义翻译和女性主义翻译，两类研究着眼于如何以翻译为中介，促成、揭示或抵制殖民、新殖民、性别歧视等行为，强调若干翻译策略及文本选择的文化功能，为维护跨文化伦理这一终极目标发挥了不可或缺的作用，然而，在经历了一段时间的热潮后，进展平缓，人云亦云的讨论较多，仍然留有许多有待解决的问题。翻译学者有必要继续深入地思考，翻译行为如何成为维系跨文化伦理的工具？挑战跨文化伦理的行为如何受到批判？如何保证跨文化伦理更有效地规约？翻译还涉及宗教群体、阶级群体等文化群体，翻译促成或阻碍文化群体间合理交往的方式存在多样性，许多违背跨文化伦理的行为不能简单地划定为殖民、新殖民或性别歧视，许多谋求跨文化伦理的行为目的并非限于抵抗，同一服从或违背跨文化伦理译文对于不同价值观取向的读者群、评论人、赞助人理解和反响方式多样，而相关的翻译策略、赞助行为、读者反应、翻译批评等许多方面的研究尚未全面展开。因此，本文尝试通过较为细致、严谨地研究跨文化伦理对于翻译理论和实践的规约的必要性、方式及效果，促使更多学者更为深入地关注“文化转向”后的翻译理论及实践，推动文化中介功能相关的翻译研究的进一步发展。

全文共分六章，重点章节为二、三、四章。

第一章为引言，主要阐述本研究的理论背景、意图、角度及方法，通过对于

文化取向的翻译研究、翻译伦理研究、翻译规约研究等方面的理论综述，尝试较清晰地论证跨文化伦理的定义以及本研究的重要意义。

第二章从译者地位、语言层次、忠实程度、异质忠实等侧面回顾国内外忠实策略的研究，质疑 André Lefevere 对于中西方忠实传统的误读及其它相关观点，进而提出，以往的忠实翻译研究往往局限于对“直译”与“意译”或是“归化”与“异化”之间的争论，忽视译者文化动机的适度。如果人们能够从跨文化伦理角度审视这些问题，突破二元对立的窠臼，将有可能在一定程度上对以往的研究进行有益的补充。从跨文化伦理的角度考察，准确的译文不一定合理。同时，Warren (1989:20), Chesterman(1997:80) 等学者认为，翻译主体有必要履行合作、服从等责任。然而，本章对于赞助行为、翻译评论等方面的论证表明，翻译主体的行为可能不合乎跨文化伦理，从而共同生成有损于某文化群体的译文，或共同导致某些译文受到不应有的排斥。跨文化伦理是保证翻译合理性的必要规约。

以往的译者主体研究往往忽视译者主体性的公正、适度的跨文化关联。本文第三章指出，跨文化伦理从翻译策略、文本取向以及语言杂糅等侧面，为译者主体性提供了新的诠释视角，是食人主义、杂合、异化、归化、劫持等挑战传统翻译规则的译论引发广泛关注的深层次动因。本章分析了相关理论和研究的独特性及缺憾。例如，在分析 foreignization 成为热点的原因以及纠正对于 Lawrence Venuti 的误解的同时，通过对于国内 1998 年至 2006 年间采用异化和翻译作为关键词的 670 余篇论文的统计分析，本次调查发现，Venuti 对于国内研究的广泛影响至少在 1999 年开始出现，之前的讨论更多涉及我国本土的异化或欧化策略；受到 Venuti 的影响，截至 2006 年，国内学者更多倾向于异化策略，归化策略、语言归化/文化异化等并非主流；国内大部分学者并非盲目因循西方理论，而是更多地与中国实际结合，主张恰当地根据译者动机、文本类型等组合两种策略；同时，我国的异化策略研究明显侧重于翻译的文化传播功能，虽然跨文化伦理倾向逐年递增，但是比重偏低。本章也讨论了跨文化伦理在其它方面对于译者主体性的规约，如交互式翻译、自翻译、作者翻译等。通过论述 Sydney Shapiro 以及 Pearl Buck 对于《水浒传》译文的不同处理，以及 *The Gadfly* 中译文的读者效应等，本章论证了由于不同译者接受跨文化伦理规约方式的差异，译者主体性相对独立于跨文化伦理规约。

本文作者赞同 René Descartes 的主体观，主张译者与作为客体的文化语境之间存在互动，译者会发挥主体性，通过有意识的翻译行为促使跨文化伦理被接受。同时，她强调跨文化伦理对于译者主体性的规约受到其它参数的影响，如官方政策、社会背景、译者取向等。

第四章论述了跨文化伦理规约翻译的途径，指出至少存在五种规约方式，即简单或繁复的规约、多渠道的规约、单方或互动的规约、半独立的规约以及接纳或拒斥的规约。存在简单或者繁复的跨文化伦理规约模式。由于文化群体的多样性，后殖民女性主义译者以及其它意识形态取向的译者会采用相同或不同的策略，处理其支持或反对的不同跨文化伦理变体；由于文化的流动性，同一跨文化伦理会在不同时期产生不同的效果，某跨文化伦理变体会由于另一跨文化伦理变体的存在而被重新阐释；存在多渠道的跨文化伦理规约模式。通过大量的译文分析，本文作者发现，维护跨文化伦理的文本、违背跨文化伦理的文本或者无明显跨文化伦理关联的文本，都会通过多样的翻译策略，转化为支持跨文化伦理的译文；存在单方或者互动的跨文化伦理规约模式。作者会改变观点，与译者共同修改原文，促成跨文化伦理动机的实现，可见 Roland Barthes (1977:148)以及 Paul de Man(1986:84)提出的原作或作者死亡的观点具有局限性；跨文化伦理半独立规约，后殖民主义翻译研究以及女性主义翻译研究等之所以接受和深入分析跨文化伦理，导源于特定的历史背景并得益于心理分析、解构主义、马克思主义等理论，已有的分析失之零散，本章尝试进行较系统的回顾；跨文化伦理规约是否被接受，取决于其对于目的文化主流意识形态和赞助人的迎合，这种迎合并非整齐划一。目的文化中的意识形态会倾向于排斥跨文化伦理，此时跨文化伦理成为特例性的规约，可见意识形态的操控会有损于翻译的文化中介效果；跨文化伦理有必要迎合赞助人，由于多层次的赞助人之间会存在分歧，某些赞助人可能创造条件，促成一些被官方赞助人压制并合乎跨文化伦理的译文的面世与流传，某些违背跨文化伦理的作品可能受到某些国家赞助人的支持，却引起其它国家赞助人的反感，可见操控学派的赞助理论有待细化。

翻译主体遵循跨文化伦理规约并不能保证翻译行为合理。本文第五章通过分析包含 TNIV 在内的近十本《圣经》译文的语料库，总结了对于 TNIV 译文评论的

不完备性，并通过大量其它例证，指出得体的策略、有责任感的赞助以及恰如其分的翻译批评是保证翻译适度维护跨文化伦理的必要前提。其中，评论人介入的质量如何把握，罕见有学者深入分析，本章从跨文化伦理规约的角度提出翻译策略评论的合理性、翻译目的评论的合理性以及关于其他评论人评论的合理性等三个标准。

为了保证翻译作为维系文化间真诚、友好交往的桥梁，跨文化伦理具有存在和深入研究的理据。

关键词: 跨文化伦理; 翻译伦理; 规约; 翻译主体; 翻译

Contents

Synopsis	i
Chapter One Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background of this study	1
1.1.1 Cultural turn of translation studies.....	1
1.1.2 Researches on translation ethics	4
1.1.3 Researches on translation norms	5
1.2 Definition of intercultural ethic in translation	5
1.2.1 Definition of “intercultural”	5
1.2.2 Definition of “ethic”	6
1.2.3 Intercultural ethic distinct from other translation ethics.....	7
1.2.3.1 Ethics positively analytic.....	7
1.2.3.2 Ethics of difference.....	8
1.2.3.3 Ethics in interculturality	10
1.2.3.4 Ethics in a culture	12
1.2.3.5 Ethics between subjects.....	12
1.2.4 Intercultural ethic distinct from politics	15
1.2.5 Intercultural ethic distinct from ideology	16
1.3 Intercultural ethic as a norm of translation.....	17
1.3.1 Researches on norms in translation	17
1.3.1.1 Toury’s viewpoints.....	17
1.3.1.2 Chesterman’s viewpoints	19
1.3.1.3 Other researches on norms in translation	21
1.3.2 Intercultural ethic as a norm in translation	22
1.4 Research methods of the present study	23
1.4.1 A combination of deduction and induction.....	23
1.4.2 Case studies	23
1.4.3 Corpus-based analysis	23
1.5 Organization of the dissertation.....	24
1.6 Significance of the present study	25

Chapter Two Intercultural Ethic as an Indispensable

Norm of the Decency of Translation.....29

2.1 The decency of translation strategies: a case study on fidelity..... 29

2.1.1 A brief survey of previous researches on fidelity 29

2.1.1.1 Fidelity and the visibility of a translator 29

2.1.1.2 Language layers for fidelity 33

2.1.1.3 Degrees of fidelity 34

2.1.1.4 Fidelity to the foreignness 36

2.1.1.5 Fidelity to the truth 36

2.1.1.6 Fidelity in China and the West — a challenge to André Lefevere 36

2.1.1.7 Suspect of fidelity 41

2.1.2 Intercultural ethic as a necessary norm of fidelity 41

2.1.2.1 Fluent fidelity 42

2.1.2.2 Unintelligible fidelity 45

2.1.2.3 Rationality of infidelity 47

2.2 The decency of patronage 50

2.2.1 Selection of the original 50

2.2.2 Translation strategies 50

2.3 The decency of translation criticism 51

2.3.1 Professionals for intercultural ethic 52

2.3.2 Professionals against intercultural ethic 54

2.4 The decency of reading responses 55

2.4.1 Audience within a culture 55

2.4.2 Audience across cultures 56

2.5 Summary 57

Chapter Three Intercultural Ethic as a Norm of

Translators' Subjectivity.....60

3.1 Definition of translators' subjectivity 60

3.2 Translators' subjectivity motivated with the norm of intercultural ethic.....	61
3.2.1 Translation strategies challenging ST authority	61
3.2.1.1 Cannibalism	61
3.2.1.2 Hybridity	65
3.2.1.3 Foreignization and domestication.....	69
3.2.1.4 Hijacking	90
3.2.2 Translations with blurred author-translator dichotomy	92
3.2.2.1 Interactive translation	92
3.2.2.2 Autotranslation	93
3.2.2.3 The author's translation	93
3.3 Intercultural ethic as a relative norm of translators' subjectivity	96
3.3.1 Different translations for intercultural ethic: a case study on <i>Shui Hu Zhuan</i>	96
3.3.2 Influence of translators' subjectivity upon intercultural ethic	101
3.4 Intercultural ethic normalizing translators' subjectivity with other parameters	102
3.4.1 Official policies	103
3.4.2 Social contexts	104
3.4.3 Personal inclination	108
3.5 Summary	110

Chapter Four Basic Patterns of Intercultural Ethic as a Norm of Translation.....113

4.1 Intercultural ethic: simplex vs. multiplex.....	113
4.1.1 Diversity of cultures and intercultural ethic	113
4.1.1.1 Translations for one variety of intercultural ethic instead of another	113
4.1.1.2 Translations for different varieties of intercultural ethic.....	113

4.1.2 Mobility of cultures and intercultural ethic	121
4.1.2.1 Variable attitudes to intercultural ethic	121
4.1.2.2 Reinterpretation of one intercultural ethic for another intercultural ethic	122
4.2 Intercultural ethic: multichannel	124
4.2.1 Texts for intercultural ethic.....	124
4.2.2 Texts against intercultural ethic	133
4.2.3 Texts without visible relevance with intercultural ethic	134
4.3 Intercultural ethic: unilateral vs. interactive	149
4.4 Intercultural ethic: semi-detached	150
4.4.1 Postcolonial translation studies with the norm of intercultural ethic	150
4.4.2 Feminist translation studies with the norm of intercultural ethic	163
4.5 Intercultural ethic: accepted vs. rejected	171
4.5.1 Intercultural ethic conditioned by dominant ideology.....	171
4.5.1.1 Ideology as a requisite for translations normalized with intercultural ethic.....	171
4.5.1.2 Ideology against intercultural ethic normalizing translation	172
4.5.2 Intercultural ethic conditioned by patronage	172
4.5.2.1 Hierarchical patronage.....	172
4.5.2.2 Patronage across nations.....	174
4.5.2.3 Relativity of the patronage	174
4.6 Summary	175

Chapter Five Preconditions for Proper Translation

Normalized with Intercultural Ethic.....179

5.1 Appropriate strategies for intercultural ethic	179
5.2 Responsible patronage for intercultural ethic	181
5.3 Decent criticism for intercultural ethic.....	182
5.3.1 Evaluation of translation strategies.....	183

5.3.2 Evaluation of translation purposes	184
5.3.3 Evaluation of other professionals	189
5.4 Summary	190
 Chapter Six Conclusion	 192
 Notes	 198
Bibliography	218
Appendix	235
Acknowledgements.....	239

Degree papers are in the "[Xiamen University Electronic Theses and Dissertations Database](#)". Full texts are available in the following ways:

1. If your library is a CALIS member libraries, please log on <http://etd.calis.edu.cn/> and submit requests online, or consult the interlibrary loan department in your library.
2. For users of non-CALIS member libraries, please mail to etd@xmu.edu.cn for delivery details.

厦门大学博硕士论文摘要库